DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 178 EA 030 499

AUTHOR	Southworth, Geoff
TITLE	School Leadership in English Schools at the Close of the 20th Century: Puzzles, Problems and Cultural Insights.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Institutional Evaluation; *Instructional Leadership; National Surveys; *Principals; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the headship (principalship) in English schools so as to trace the cultural and historical antecedents of educational leadership in England. It focuses on three perceptions: (1) School leadership in England continues to be preoccupied with organizational power relations; (2) These relations tend to sustain the domination of leaders in "their" schools; and (3) Such a configuration of authority has implications for schooling and democracy. The paper examines the many reforms of the 1990s, dividing them into two groups: those reforms introduced by conservatives and those initiated by the Labor Party. Numerous themes arose from these reforms, such as competition, decentralization and centralization, accountability, and school improvement, and each of these themes is examined. How these reforms have affected the headship in English schools, such as the increased emphasis on leadership and management, is treated at length. The paper concludes that while school leadership reflects and sustains historical and cultural traditions, traditions are not immutable. Over the last decade corporatist and capitalist values of choice, competition, and consumerism have been explicitly added to bureaucratic and managerial values. Furthermore, shared leadership is largely contingent upon the individual headteacher's preferences and seems to be a concession that headteachers grant to others. (Contains 31 references.) (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 178

School Leadership in English Schools at the Close of the 20th Century: Puzzles, problems and cultural insights

Geoff Southworth

University of Reading

Paper presented at the 'Implications of Cultural Context for Understanding the Changing Role of School Leaders: Opportunities and Limitations of Comparative Perspectives' symposium

American Educational Research Association

Annual Conference

New Orleans, April 2000

Do not quote or use without permission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Southworth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Correspondence:
Professor Geoff Southworth
The University of Reading
School Improvement and Leadership Centre
School of Education
Bulmershe Court
Earley
READING RG6 1HY
UK

Tel: +44-118-931-8857
Fax: +44-118-931-8863
e-mail G.W.Southworth@reading.ac.uk

EA 030 499

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School Leadership in English Schools at the Close of the 20th Century: Puzzles, problems and cultural insights

Introduction:

The aim of the paper is to draw upon analyses of headship in English schools in order to trace the cultural and historical antecedents of leadership. Having identified some of the cultural traditions which underpin current policy-making I will argue that:

[a] School leadership in England continues to be pre-occupied with organisational power relations;
[b] These relations tend to sustain the domination of leaders in 'their' schools; and
[c] Such a configuration of authority has implications for schooling and democracy.

Given the aims of the symposium, this argument is significant for two reasons. First, it is important to try to understand the assumptions, values and beliefs which shape leadership in any given context. Second, because internationalisation in educational administration has tended to draw superficial comparisons between policies and practices in different countries without developing thorough understandings of the contexts, histories and cultures within which they have become established. Theory and practice in educational management is socially constructed and more strongly contextually bound than some are prepared to admit (Dimmock & Walker, 2000). To avoid the simplistic borrowing of ideas from elsewhere, as well as to prevent ethnocentric theorising and prescription, it is essential that educational leadership develops a comparative, international study dimension and that these studies embrace cultural and cross-cultural perspectives (Dimmock & Walker, 2000). Therefore, this particular paper should be read alongside the others prepared for this symposium because only then will a cross-cultural dimension be provided.

As a standalone document, this paper provides only an outline sketch of the contextual, historical and cultural features which shape school leadership in England. Within the confines of a short paper it is not possible to provide a detailed analysis of the issues because they are simply too large. Nevertheless, the paper will draw upon a number of studies, both scholarly and empirical, which have attempted to trace the cultural roots and influences upon leadership. I have taken this course to delineate an argument which I hope to develop in greater depth at a later point.

The paper is organised into four sections. In the first section I catalogue the major reforms which have been introduced in England during the last decade. In the second I briefly review the policy themes in these reforms. The third focuses on how the reforms relate to headship and how the role of headteachers in England reflects cultural and historical assumptions, values and beliefs. I argue in this section that the identified beliefs shape headship in particular ways and have implications for leadership and schooling in democratic societies. The fourth section sets out my conclusions and suggestions for future work.

1: Recent reforms

The last decade of the 20th century was a time of unprecedented reform and restructuring in English education. Policy makers introduced legislation which caused considerable upheaval in the educational system. The consequential effects on the roles and responsibilities of the teachers and headteachers who have been caught up in this 'whirlwind' of change have yet to be rigorously researched using large samples. Nevertheless, small scale studies revealed that these actors found the experience challenging and difficult because of: ideological differences between policy-makers and practitioners; the scale and pace of the reforms; the lack of sensible implementation strategies in the early years of restructuring; and the sheer amount of administrative change, personal uncertainty and professional confusion which resulted and which heads and teachers had to deal with on a daily basis (Southworth, 1995a; Webb & Vulliamy, 1996; Southworth et al, 1998). In other words, educational change became 'ubiquitous

and relentless' and the concomitant turbulence which reforms created became so common that it could be characterised as systemic (Fullan, 1993, p. 3).

The major reforms that were introduced fall chronologically into two groups - those introduced by the conservative governments of Thatcher and Major, and those latterly put in place by the Blair administration. The conservative government's reforms included:

- the construction and implementation of a National Curriculum;
- introduction of a national system of testing pupils at the ages of 7, 11, 14 and 16;
- the publication of schools' test results and the use of league tables to rate schools' apparent success;
- open enrolment - that is, the right of parents to choose the school they wish their child to attend;
- local management of schools (LMS), or as is it is called in the US site-based management (although the US version is nothing like as extensive as that in the England);
- as part of LMS each school is funded on the basis of the annual number of pupils attending the school;
- the creation of the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) which set in place the week-long inspection of all schools, once every 4 years (latterly relaxed to once every six years), the publishing of the every schools inspection report, the grading of schools, including the classification of some schools to be judged to have 'severe weaknesses' (i.e. to be very weak schools) and schools requiring 'special measures' (i.e. judged to be failing and in need of rapid improvement or, if that proves unsuccessful, for the school to be closed);
- the introduction of school development plans, later revised to incorporate the setting of improvement targets;
- reform of the initial teacher training system;
- a national programme of training for prospective and newly appointed headteachers;

The Blair government's reforms include:

- The introduction of a National Literacy Strategy into every primary (elementary) school from September 1998;
- The introduction into every primary school of a National Numeracy Strategy from September 1999;
- The setting of numerical targets for pupils' attainments in every school, linked to the government's pledge to increase pupils' scores in national assessment tests by the year 2002;
- revisions to the National Curriculum following a five year moratorium on curriculum and the designing of a curriculum 2000;
- the intention to link teacher performance to rewards and pay;
- the articulation of national standards for headteachers and other school leaders;
- the creation of a National College for School Leadership which will be responsible for headteacher training;
- defining teacher competencies in Information and Communication Technologies;
- further devolution of funds to schools and reduced financial autonomy for local education authorities (school districts).

Moreover, the Labour administration has generally left in place the reforms of the previous Conservative government. Thus although there are differences between these two sets of reforms, there are also certain continuities, thereby making it possible to identify some common themes in the reforms.

2. Reform themes

The reforms reflect a number of policy-making themes which, in turn, have implications for school leaders. Here I will focus on the following themes:

- Competition
- De-centralisation and centralisation

- Accountability
- Policy-makers' belief in leadership / headship
- School improvement

Moreover, these themes show how the cultures of education and schooling, that is the values, beliefs and norms which underpin and influence practitioners' behaviours, have been contoured in certain ways, either explicitly or implicitly.

Throughout the Conservative government's time in office in the 1990s there was an explicit intention to subject schools to 'market forces' by increasing competition between them. The policies for open enrolment, parental choice, the publication of results and the funding of schools according to the number of pupils attending them were mechanisms for encouraging successful schools to grow while, at the same time, pressuring less successful ones to do better or perish.

Related to this policy were several others. There was increased devolution of powers to schools, mostly in respect of the discretion they had to manage their own financial affairs, although a new type of school was also created, the grant maintained schools which elected to 'opt out' of local government (school district) control and become wholly self-determining. Thus between them, the LMS and grant maintained school initiatives created schools which were more or less self-managing establishments.

Such decentralisation was however coupled to a counter-balancing increase in centralisation. The national curriculum provided a common framework for self-managing schools to adhere to. National assessments also limited the scope for experimentation in instructional practices. Centralisation also ensured there was increasing specification in roles and responsibilities, while the emphasis on accountability is a theme in itself.

The publication of test data, the use of league tables and the inspection of schools combine to create one of the strongest accountability regimes in the English speaking

world. Schools may have become self-managing, but they are also monitored closely, frequently and publicly. Furthermore, the scrutiny of schools is such that it is high stakes accountability. A poor OfSTED inspection report tarnishes the school's reputation, frequently lowers morale in the school and is often, but not always (depending on tenure) interpreted as a reflection on the school's leadership, in particular the headteacher, and especially so in primary schools.

This latter point is important because all politicians from whichever party share a common belief in the power of leadership. One of the unshakeable tenets, bolstered by school effectiveness research which has been cited time and again by policy-makers to the point it has become an article of faith, if not a mantra, is the idea that school leaders - especially headteachers (principals) - can make a significant difference to a school's levels of performance. Headteachers have been portrayed as central figures, key people and pivotal players in the national enterprise of school improvement which is now at the heart of the Blair government's project. Hence the emphasis on heads' training needs and the creation of a National College for School Leadership which is currently being established and built.

For example, within a matter of a few weeks of winning the election, the Labour government published a White paper 'Excellence in Schools' (DfEE, 1997) setting out it's specific education policy intentions. The paper heralded a "crusade for higher standards" (p. 4) and promised, in the chapter on standards and accountability, to publish more data than ever before on each school's level of academic performance (p. 25). Also, headteachers were urged to monitor the classroom performance of teachers (p. 26). This reference to headteachers pointed to a belief, common among policy-makers, in the influence of headteachers to manage the reforms and improvement efforts in their schools: "The quality of the headteacher is a crucial factor in the success of a school" (p. 29). And:

> The vision for learning set out in this White Paper will demand the highest qualities of leadership and management from headteachers. The quality of the

> head often makes the difference between success and failure of a school. Good heads can transform a school; poor heads can block progress and achievement. It is essential that we have measures in place to strengthen the skills of all new and serving heads.
>
> We intend to ensure that in future all those appointed as headteachers for the first time hold a professional headship qualification which demonstrates that they have the leadership skills necessary to motivate staff and pupils to manage a school.
>
> (p. 46)

These remarks demonstrate that policy-makers' emphasis on high-stakes accountability and school improvement are inexorably tied to strongly held beliefs about the nature and impact of organisational leadership. Furthermore, if 'culture' means the values, norms, traditions, customs, rituals and symbols of a group (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hargreaves, 1995) then the emphasis placed on headteachers is not only a theme, but one which has symbolic significance. Inspection data, school effectiveness research and improvement studies have been cited in a ritualised fashion so that policy-makers and practitioners alike uncritically believe the correspondence between successful school and 'good' head to be axiomatic and causal. Therefore, while the reform process in England warrants detailed analysis in terms of the policy issues, within the parameters of this paper it is important to explore the influence and impact of the reforms upon headteachers.

3. Reforms and headship

Without doubt the reform programme has created numerous changes and challenges for teachers and headteachers alike. In terms of school leadership and, in particular, headship, there have been two changes underway:

1. Increased specification of responsibilities and competencies; most visible in the articulation by central government of national professional standards for headteachers.

2. Increased emphasis on leadership, as well as on management.

I highlight these two sets of changes because they point to the emergence over the last decade of what some call New Public Management [NPM] (Hood, 1991; Mahoney & Moos, 1998). This new form of managerialism is introduced in different countries in different ways, but is generally based on seven doctrines:

- hands-on professional management;
- explicit standards and measures of performance;
- greater emphasis on output controls;
- break-up of large organisations operating on decentralised budgets;
- introduction of competition;
- stress on commercial styles of management;
- stress on doing more for less (Hood, 1991, pp. 4 – 5).

These doctrines are certainly evident in the English educational reforms. However, analyses of NPM suggest that it is also accompanied by 'old managerialism' with its focus on intensifying systems of direct control (Ball, 1997, p. 259). The idea that old and new forms go along side-by-side is a significant point because it implies that change is not always about jettisoning previous ways of working, but rather of adding to them. Consequently, control in educational organisations becomes a matter of developing 'loose-tight' structures and systems. There may decentralisation on some issues yet more centralisation in others. For example, in England during the 1990s central control of school budgets was loosened, while central control of the curriculum and of accountabilities were considerably tightened. However, what is most important to note is that neither the old nor the new forms of managerialism suggest that organisational control is relinquished or transformed. Leaders are held accountable and thus they are understandably reluctant to let go of decisions for which they are held individually responsible.

This perspective parallels Grace's (1995) insightful analysis of school leadership in England in the 19th and 20th centuries. Grace argues that the 19th century traditions of

school leadership, being an expression of social class power, gave way in the middle of the 20th century to a more meritocratic conceptualisation of the headteacher as professional leader (pp. 28 – 30). However, since the late 1980s another, newer discourse has been used, one which advanced a market culture in education and educational leadership. This commodification of education, with its attendant language of 'output', 'products', 'value added' and 'measurable product', describes the curriculum as an entity to be 'delivered' and parents and pupils as consumers. It also positions the headteacher more as the chief executive than as the leading professional (pp. 40 – 1), and:

> The emergence of the headteacher as entrepreneurial leader and chief executive in the 1980s and 1990s marks, insofar as these become the dominant constructs, the final secularisation and commodification of the educational process. The most important characteristics of effective school leaders are now less to be found in their moral, scholarly or professional qualities than in their 'street-wise' capacity to survive and exploit market opportunities for education. (p. 42)

However, while these transitions have been taking place, Grace argues that other patterns have been more enduring:

> English schooling culture in the 20th century has always had, at its heart, a major paradox and contradiction. Formally designated as the cultural agency for 'making democracy work' and involved, at specific periods, with explicit pedagogical projects to enhance education for citizenship, its own practice has remained largely undemocratic. (p. 46)

The reasons for this are complex but one major factor is the influence of the hierarchical headteacher tradition:

> Although this has been modified over the years into more consultative forms, the fact remains that most headteachers are the operative school leaders and few examples exist of serious organisational democracy involving major decision-making in association with teachers, pupils and other school staff.
>
> This lack of a democratic culture and practice in English school life, it can be claimed, is itself a mediated form of historical hidden curriculum of English political and social culture. Despite an early achievement of formal political democracy in England, social and cultural forms have remained pervaded by

> aristocratic and hierarchical values; in particular, the notion that there is a leadership class. (p. 56)

In other words, although there has been a great deal of surface change, power relations within schools have proved remarkably constant.

The stability of power relations in schools is a theme in my own empirical research into school leadership. My research is essentially an on-going, cumulative project. Over two decades I have investigated, through a series of related studies, the role, work and experience of headteachers. Using qualitative methods (mostly interviews and case studies) I have examined headship from a number of standpoints, including:

- collegiality (Southworth, 1987)
- organisational culture (Nias et al, 1989)
- learning organisations (Nias et al, 1992; Southworth, 1994)
- professional identity (Southworth, 1995)
- change management (Southworth 1995a)
- school improvement (Southworth, 1998; 1999; Southworth et al, 1998)

Together these studies show that primary school headship has shifted in its emphases and concerns over time. For example, there has been an intensification of the demands made on heads and of their workloads. The need to be able to manage productively external change agendas and to demonstrate enhanced levels of performance has also been heightened, while many heads have become interested in 'marketing the school', managing the school's image and reputation, or have become embroiled in entrepreneurial activities.

Yet, running through all these studies is one constancy, the belief in the headteacher as the single-most influential person in the school, which ultimately translates into lone leadership. While changes abound, as I have argued elsewhere (Southworth, 1999a; 1999b), the major continuity is the idea that the head is the pivotal player in the school.

Expressed another way, although the *content* of headship shifts and changes, the *character* of leadership continues.

Further support for this interpretation comes from a review of the literature focusing on school leadership in England. Three major role continuities were identified:

The persistence of work patterns – variety, fragmentation and busyness characterise their work schedules;
Ego-identification – heads feeling personally responsible for 'their' schools;
Power – heads are keenly aware of their influence, authority, and control and recognise themselves as powerful individuals (Hall & Southworth, 1997)

The recurrence of these themes is so strong that Coulson's early, landmark analyses of primary headship (1975; 1978) are still relevant today. Twenty-five years ago Coulson described how heads identified themselves with the schools they led, regarding them as 'theirs' in a very possessive way and being very powerful figures inside the schools they led. Today, they continue to hold a formidable concentration of power and can exercise control over the form and direction of internal developments. Moreover, little attention is paid to other school leaders in the literature, so that the sheer amount of space devoted to heads signifies the central importance of heads to the school's health and success (Southworth, 1995).

Indeed, primary heads are often in the position whereby they dominate their schools (Southworth, 1995). And, despite some cosmetic changes, power relations are (generally) remarkably enduring. While autocratic styles of leadership have given way to more consultative ones, consultation should not be confused with democracy; 'authoritarianism need not have an ugly face and yet it is authoritarianism for all that' (White, 1982).

While conceptions of educational leadership are dynamic, contested and historically and culturally situated, these conceptions are not simply technical formulations for increasing

organisational efficiency and effectiveness, they are also expressions of cultural values (Grace, 1995, p. 192). Furthermore:

> The form and nature of educational leadership has implications for the reproduction, modification or transformation of the wider social, cultural and political features of the society in which it is situated. It has implications for the socialisation of individuals, the formation of citizens and the structuring of social relations… (p. 192)

Although such generalisation can appear to deny that some individuals will and can do otherwise, as Gidden's (1979) work shows the relationship between agency and structure often results in individuals being shaped more by structure than the reverse. Also, while there have been important developments in the discourse of leadership throughout the twentieth century, these have probably not generated corresponding shifts in the practice of leadership. Presently there is much interest in transformational leadership, as well as critical and reflective leadership, but the pressures leaders face every day makes them much more pragmatic than philosophic or critical in their leadership actions (Southworth, 1999).

Although it is now less common to hear heads talk about 'my' school the move to talking about 'our' school does not necessarily mark a very radical change. Teachers may have become more involved in decision-making at the school level, but pupils, parents and the community remain largely uninvolved. External legal and bureaucratic structures continue to operate as if the headteacher was (subject to the formal responsibilities of the school governors) *the* manifest school leader. Nor should it escape attention that while more consultative approaches appear to have been introduced, latterly the emphasis on the head as chief executive has inhibited, if not blocked, further moves towards participation.

At the close of the 20th century contemporary conceptions of headship in England incorporate notions of:

- Individualism
- Hierarchical organisation
- Positional power
- Authority dependence
- Consumerism

Despite academics and others calling for more critical, ethical and emancipatory approaches to leadership (Foster, 1986; Smyth, 1989; Bates, 1989) these have not been adopted on a widespread basis. Although in the 19th century headteachers were expected to give moral and ethical direction, "contemporary leadership has become, in an important sense, devalued" (Grace, 1995, p. 156).

Pupils and parents are regarded as clients and customers, rather than citizens. Education is legitimised more on economic grounds than for civic or communitarian reasons. As preparation for life in a democratic society leadership is not realising its potential. Schools and their leaders, at best, reflect a very circumscribed notion of democracy. Yet schools are model organisations for their pupils and the capacity of schools to teach pupils about social values and organisation is great.

Unfortunately, "English education has a history of power domination rather than of power sharing" (p. 202). And the recent and current reforms in English education continue to create and sustain structures, which ensure that schools endure as organised hierarchies and in which the position of the headteacher is paramount. Thus for historical and cultural reasons headship in England has neither been transformed and nor become 'transformational'. Nineteenth and 20th century beliefs underpin its passage into the 21st century.

4. Conclusions

This brief and in places hurried discussion points first to the need for a more considered and comprehensive exegesis. Although I have drawn upon the work of other scholars whose analyses support the argument I have developed here, much more work remains to be done to synthesise their thinking and my own and to articulate a more convincing and elaborate thesis.

There is also a need to include a more complex portrait of headship today than I have done here. The challenges headteachers describe, the mixed metaphors they use to characterise their roles and the ironical professional stories and anecdotes they tell when interviewed imply that their work is frequently full of dualities, contradictions and dilemmas. Some, for example, see themselves as caught on the horns of the participation-control dilemma (Ball, 1987). That is, while on the one hand they are urged to involve staff, on the other, they are told they remain in control and are responsible for all that occurs in the school (Southworth, 1987; 1995). In this paper I have ignored the professional puzzles and tensions heads encounter and strive to resolve for themselves, in the schools in which they work, simply in order to make my line of argument starker.

Given these deficiencies, I nevertheless believe that five further conclusions can be made:

1. School leadership does reflect historical and cultural traditions and it also sustains them. Grace's work, which I have cited on several occasions, is one of the most scholarly and penetrating examples of this in English educational writing. More internationally, the work of Smyth (1989) and his collaborators shows how critical theory can help uncover the underlying assumptions about leadership and schooling. Such studies demonstrate that leadership is a social construction which while always being refined by successive generations, is also held together by deeper structural beliefs, which have an enduring quality to them. As a construct, leadership in England is a mix of change and continuity, but the continuities are pervasive and provide the foundational beliefs for headship. to endure as proprietal, pivotal and powerful.

2.The interpretation of headship discussed in this paper suggests that in England school leadership is based upon a set of traditions which circumscribe the role as:

- individualistic
- proprietal
- pivotal
- powerful

This is not to say that some aspects of leadership are not shared with others, they are. But it is also the case that shared leadership is largely contingent upon the individual headteacher's preferences, as studies of the roles of deputy heads in primary schools show. In other words, shared leadership is often a *concession* the headteacher grants to others.

These traditions about power relations in schools reflect hierarchical assumptions about organisational positions. They also reflect power relations in classrooms. While it can be argued that the bureaucratic traditions of school organisation are one set of assumptions about leadership, another is the occupational culture and structures of teaching and learning. Power relations in classrooms place the teacher at the very centre of transactions. The teacher is the pivotal player and her or his exercise of control and authority sets the tone for almost everything else.

As I have argued elsewhere (Southworth, 1995), assumptions about power at both the classroom and the school levels are complementary. Teachers being dominant in their own sphere of influence – the classroom – accept, in turn, the head's right to exercise power over them at the school level. Also, teachers and headteachers legitimate their authority in broadly consistent ways – they have similar feelings of responsibility for others, need to feel in control and want to be themselves (pp. 175 – 9). Thus a particular set of beliefs about power relations become sedimented into teachers' and headteachers'

consciousness which are further supported and reinforced by historical and cultural traditions.

3. These traditions though are not immutable. They are sufficiently plastic to absorb contemporary values and emphases. In England over the last decade corporatist and capitalist values of choice, competition and consumerism have been explicitly added to bureaucratic and managerialist values. While there are some tensions within this admixture they generally sustain the same expectations of leaders.

Leadership is thus like a palimpsest – that is a text in which more recent scripts are superimposed on earlier ones. Yet the earlier forms also show through the superimposed text so that a sense of history, antecedence and layers of meaning are hinted at. Understood as a palimpsest leadership must be seen as an historical, social and cultural specific construction.

4. Although at present there is global interest in the role of leaders as change agents, with consequent concerns about developing the leadership capacities of headteachers and principals, it is central to my argument and the metaphor of the palimpsest, that such global interest should not ignore cultural differences. What I have described here is an indigenous view of leadership and we need many more of them to develop an "indigenous knowledge base" on school leadership (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Dimmock & Walker, 1998; Walker, Bridges & Chan, 1996).

As Hallinger and Kantamara (2000) argue, culturally-grounded research is needed. Leading organisational change is fundamentally a cultural process, as many scholars believe (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Fullan, 1993; Evans, 1996; Schein, 1996), but these writers employ organisational culture as the conceptual framework for understanding change. Hallinger and Kantamara employ national culture as the conceptual lens. Their work shows that understanding leadership processes across cultures is complex but that:

> We can only understand the nature of leadership by exposing the hidden assumptions of the cultural context. This will open new windows through which to view educational leadership. (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000)

Separate country studies may no longer be sufficient to deal with the global forces at work in education:

> The argument is simply that as a field of study, educational management and leadership needs to reflect the globalising and internationalising of policy and practice. To do that, we need a comparative branch to the field that is rigorous and reflects a cross-cultural dimension. The reasons and benefits are manifold. First, the transfer of policy across boundaries that continue to ignore societal culture is likely to heap up many future problems. Second, while scholars and practitioners remain largely ignorant about societal, economic, political, demographic and cultural differences between systems, they are likely to draw fallacious conclusions regarding the appropriateness of importing policy and practice. Third, by understanding the contexts and education systems of other countries, we may come to a better understanding of our own. (Dimmock & Walker, 2000)

5. Given the interpretation of headship in England that I have set out here, other countries which may be interested in learning about school leadership should proceed with caution. Any country which adopts the same concept of leadership as applied in England may find that they have also borrowed a concomitant set of power relations which create the circumstances for their schools to reflect, at best, a circumscribed view of democracy.

While staff in schools may *talk* about democratic ideals what pupils *see* is that their school is not a democratic organisation. Like Jackson (1989) I believe schools and classrooms have "greater moral potency than is commonly understood" (p. 4). It is unacceptable that schools are led by leaders who dominate their institutions because this negates participative democracy (Southworth, 1995, p.p. 159 – 60).

Thus other nations looking to England for examples of school leadership must be very careful lest they inadvertently injure their own civic and communitarian ideals and goals.

References

Ball, S.J. 1987, **The Micropolitics of the School**, London, Routledge

Ball, S., 1997, 'Policy Sociology and Critical Social Research: a personal review of recent education policy and policy research', **British Journal of Sociology of Education**, 15[1];79 – 91

Bates, R., 1989, 'Leadership and the Rationalisation of Society' in Smyth [ed.] **Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership**, London, Falmer Press

Bolman, L. & Deal, T. 1992 **Reframing Organisations**, San Francisco CA, Jossey Bass

DfEE, 1997, **Excellence in Education**, London, Department for Education & Employment

Dimmock, C & Walker, A., 2000, 'Developing Comparative and International Leadership and Management: a cross-cultural model' **School Leadership and Management,**

Evans, R., 1996, **The Human Side of Change**, San Francisco CA, Jossey Bass

Foster, W., 1986, **Paradigms and Promises: new approaches to educational administration**, New York, Prometheus books

Fullan, M. 1993, **Change Forces**, London, Falmer Press

Giddens, A., 1979, **Central Problems in Social Theory**, London, MacMillan

Grace, G., 1995, **School Leadership: Beyond educational management**, London, Falmer Press

Hall, V. & Southworth, G., 1997, 'Headship: a review of the literature', **School Leadership and Management**, 17[2]; 151-170

Hallinger, P. and Kantamara, P., 2000, 'Educational Change in Thailand: opening a window onto leadership as a cultural process,' School Leadership and Management,

Hargreaves, D. 1995, 'School Culture' **School Effectiveness and School Improvement**. 6[1]: 23-46

Jackson, P., 1989, 'Report on the Moral Life of Classrooms'' paper presented at AERA annual meeting, San Francisco CA, University of Chicago mimeo

Mahony, P. & Moos, L., 1998, 'Democracy and School Leadership in England and Denmark' **British Journal of Educational Studies**, 46[3];

Nias, J., Southworth, G. & Yeomans, P., 1989, **Staff Relationships in the Primary School: A study of school cultures**, London, Cassell

Nias, J., Southworth, G., & Campbell, P., 1992, **Whole School Curriculum Development in the Primary School**, London, Falmer Press

Schein, E, 1996, 'Culture: the missing concept in organisational studies' **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 41: 229-240

Smyth, J., [ed.] 1989, **Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership**, London, Falmer Press

Southworth, G. 1987, Primary School Headteachers and Collegiality, in Southworth, G. [ed.] **Readings in Primary School Management**, London, Falmer Press, pp. 61 - 75

Southworth, G. 1994, 'School Leadership and School Development: Reflections from research', in Southworth, G. [ed.] **Readings in Primary School Development**, London, Falmer Press, pp. 13 - 28

Southworth, G. 1995, **Looking into Primary Headship: A research-based interpretation**, London, Falmer Press

Southworth, G. 1995a, **Talking Heads: Voices of Experience; an investigation into Primary Headship in the 1990s**, Cambridge, University of Cambridge School of Education

Southworth, G., 1998, **Leading Improving Primary Schools: the work of heads and deputy headteachers**, London, Falmer Press

Southworth, G., 1999, 'Headship, Leadership and School Improvement' in Southworth, G. & Lincoln, P. [Eds.] **Supporting Improving Schools: the role of heads and LEAs in raising standards**, London, Falmer Press, pp.69 – 86

Southworth, G., 1999a, 'Continuities and Changes in Primary Headship', in Bush, T., Bell, L., Bolam, R., Glatter, R. & Ribbins, P., [Eds.] **Educational Management: redefining theory, policy and practice**, London, Paul Chapman Publishing, pp. 43 - 58

Southworth, G., 1999b, 'Primary school Leadership in England: policy, practice and theory', **School Leadership and Management**, 19[1];49 - 65

Southworth, G. Pocklington, K. & Weindling, D. 1998, **A Qualitative Study of Primary, Secondary and Special School Headteachers**, Reading, School Improvement and Leadership Centre, University of Reading

Webb, R. & Vulliamy, G. 1996; **Roles and Responsibilities in the Primary School: Changing demands, changing practices**, Buckingham, Open University Press

White, P., 1982, **Beyond Domination: An Essay in the Political Philosophy of Education, London**, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Professor Geoff Southworth
The University of Reading
School Improvement and Leadership Centre
School of Education
Bulmershe Court
Earley
READING RG6 1HY
UK